

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 31824
Ryan Mason, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 4844
Application No.: 10/787,226	:	Group Art Unit: 2443
Filed: February 27, 2004	:	Examiner: Kishin G. Belani
For: USER INTERFACE FOR REMOTE COMPUTING DEVICES	:	

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**SUMMARY OF APPLICANT-INITIATED INTERVIEW**

Sir:

Applicants thank Examiner Belani for participating in the Applicant-initiated interview conducted on December 20, 2011. In response to the examiner interview conducted December 20, 2011 and the Applicant Initiated Interview Summary mailed December 30, 2011, Applicants provide the following. The following summary constitutes a recordation contemplated by 37 C.F.R. § 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04.

**A. Brief Description of Nature of any Exhibit or Demonstration**

None.

**B. Identification of Claim(s) Discussed**

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, 21 and dependent claims 24, 36 and 40 were discussed during the interview. Namely, the rejection of claims 21, 24, 36 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §112 and rejection of independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) were discussed.

**C. Identification of Specific Prior Art Discussed**

The rejection of certain features of the independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 over U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0003371 ("Coulthard") and U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0091850 ("Perholtz") were discussed.

**D. Indication Whether Agreement was Reached and Nature of Same**

The Examiner and Applicants' representative first discussed the rejection of claims 21, 24, 36 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicants pointed out that the specification provides ample structure, material or acts and one skilled in the art could identify the structure, material or acts from that description for performing the limitations recited in these claims. The Examiner in turn suggested that to advance the claims to allowance the Applicant should consider amending the claims to remove the "means for" language. No agreement was reached regarding this issue.

Next, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed the prior art rejections and specifically the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21. First, Applicants' representative presented arguments stating that the Perholtz reference fails to describe or suggest "a keystroke management window ... wherein if

**Application No.: 10/787,226**

the local keystroke management setting is disabled, all the hotkey keystrokes are processable at a first local computing device, and the remote computing device is configured to ignore the hotkey keystrokes at the remote computing device," as recited in these claims. The Examiner stated that while Perholtz described hot keys that are processed at the remote PC even when the Perholtz system is in Host mode, this is just an option, and does not need to be implemented. Applicants in turn pointed out that the prior art must be considered in its entirety, and that the portions of Perholtz relied on by the Examiner in fact describe hot keys that are processed at the Remote PC. No agreement was reached regarding this issue.

Furthermore, the Applicants' representative presented arguments pointing out that Coulthard fails to describe or suggest "wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device," as recited in claims 1, 7, 17 and 21. The Examiner stated that he has knowledge of various systems in the field that perform this feature and thus stated that he believed this feature was obvious. Applicants' representative asked that the Examiner provide evidentiary support for this contention. The Examiner then pointed to paragraph 0099 of Coulthard as support. No agreements were reached regarding this issue.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/  
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824 as  
our correspondence address.**

4 Park Plaza, Suite 1700  
Irvine, CA 92612-7108  
Phone: 949.851.0633  
Facsimile: 949.851.9348  
Date: January 26, 2012  
DM\_US 31557770-1.049051.0222